P.7284-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1891-92.
192 .
(L.R)

File o. 202.

Serial Nos., 1-5

Later references.
LR.497-38-(1-6)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Petition of Linganna, widow of Narasiah, regarding the Shanbhogi of Medahally, Belur Taluk -

To. Linganna, widow of Narasiah, Hassan District

15/ No 2001 of 24-11-91. Informs that her appeal A.5156 has been dismissed.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed
MK

2226 dated 20th February 1887

the Amildar forwarded petition of Venkataramiah offering to tender security partly in kind and partly in money for the offices of the 2 Firkas formed out of the Madihally Firka, and although he had no claim to the offices as would be seen from the Shanbogy Registers, recommended one of the 2 Scales being given to Venkataramiah, since he continued to perform the work with the Venkadeva Narasiah.

12th May 1887

26. On receipt of the above report, the Sub Dy Officer observed that Madihally Firka had been split up into 2 Firkas — Madihally and Bettadalur Firkas —, and that Narasiah the Shanbogue of the former lost his appointment for having been criminally dealt with, and under such circumstances appointed Holtekray Narasimmachar for Madihally Firka alone, who had already deposited the security of Rs: 150/. in the Savings Bank and produced the pass book.

27. The Dy Commr in his order to the Amildar of the Belur Taluq exempted Venkataramiah from the payment of the security amount on the ground that he was a very long standing and trustworthy official, and confirmed him in and to the Shanbogy Office of the Bettadaluru Firka.

No 1789 16th May

28. With reference to order No. 155 (Vide para 26 ante), the Amildar of Belur reported that in spite of written orders to Venkataramiah to hand over charge of Madihally Firka to H. Narasimma Char, he objected to do so on the pretext that he was the hereditary of that Firka, that because he pleaded inability to pay the security required of him, Narasimma Char who had readily paid up the amount, was appointed,

and

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

1. ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪದ್ಯಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿರಿ.

ಕಂಡೆನಾ ಕಾಮಧೇನುವನು ಕಲ್ಪವೃಕ್ಷವನು
ಕಂಡೆನಾ ಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿಯನು ಕಣ್ಣಾರೆ
ಕಂಡೆನಾ ಕಂಡೆನಾ ಕಂಡೆನಾ ಕಂಡೆನಾ

1

No 1 Cadl 1891

Madivalla Village
No 1 Taluk Tarikere
Kadur District

Memo.

Appeal No. 156 of 1891.

Appellant
Linganna
Widow of Nar-
-sanja, residing
at Brier,
Hassan District.

Respt.
Venkat.
Ramanja

Vakkalmanat Upon
duties of Madivalla
Taluk near Kadur
Dasavanthi Taluk 4 May/77
Name Talla from
him

In 1851. Immadi Devaraja the
Taluk consisting of Madivalla
Chavadi immediately Devaraja
Immadi Devaraja
Upon-amildar Taluk
In May 1852

In Sept 1852 Devaraja died
he married Timmakka
Linganna (Appt)
subsequently to a Taluk
Immadi was demanded

Feby 57 Appt

In May 57 Immadi
Taluk
Appt
Immadi
In August 1858 Devaraja
the Taluk of Kadur Taluk
Immadi
Immadi (Immadi)
Immadi

Subsequently Immadi
Linganna Immadi
Immadi June 1891 Appt

The Baradalu Reporter of 1867-68
shows that Nalappa was the
Shanbhog of the Madivalla
Taluk consisting of 11 villages.
Under the decree of the Hassan
District Deputy Subdh Court in
O.S. No: 795 of 1866-67 the
Appellant's husband Narsanja
was appointed Thakur Shanbhog
of the 11 Taluk. In 1868 Nar-
-sanja requested that the Sheri
-bund might be transferred
to the name of Venkatramanja
(Respt). The Amildar recom-
-mended the proposed transfer
as Narsanja had not been
doing the work satisfactorily;
and the District Officer sanc-
-tioned it subject to a further
report after 6 months. No report
appears to have been made
accordingly. In May 1881
Narsanja requested the Dy
Comm

that he might be entered to his appointment. When Sriganna Rau being made aware that Venkatramanaya had been confirmed or not, Ramanaya & Venkatramanaya entered into a private agreement & divided the Fiefs between themselves, the former retaining Madhalli & 4 other villages and the latter getting Bettada Aur & 5 other villages. The Dy Comr. approved of the arrangement and directed that the Boundaries should not be altered & that a report should be made after one year. A report was accordingly made, and after some correspondence the matter ended in the removal of Ramanaya in 1887, as he had been by that time not only found habitually incompetent but also criminally punished. In May 1887 the Dy Comr. conferred the Hali of the Madhalli group of villages on a stranger Ramanchachari, who had furnished security, and confirmed Venkatramanaya for the Bettada Aur group. Venkatramanaya objected to hand over charge of the Madhalli group to Ramanchachari on the ground that he was the Burwardar of the whole Fief, whereupon a notice was issued calling upon Ramanaya's heirs to prove their claim to the Fief.

1 but

Narasaya requested that the
Shaikh of both the proofs
might be registered in his
son Narayandasya Narasa.
In the early part of the
year 1890 Narasaya died.
His widow (the Appellant)
also requested that the
Barnard might be entered
in her sons name. Venkat-
-ramaya claimed the
entire Barnard in his
name on the plea that
he had obtained the last
form Narasaya for a
Consideration of Rs 400. It
that he had been doing the
work of both the proofs
since 1885-86 when Nara-
-saya was convicted for
Mesappropriating Govt.
money. On 27th March
1891 the Appellant swore
a Statement before the dy
Coll: that she & Venkat-
ramaya had settled the
matter amicably and
that in accordance there-
-with the Barnard of the
Bijapore Alur Scale of 5 Villages
should be registered in her
son Narayandasya name
that of the Mashkalli Scale
being confirmed in the
name of Venkatramaya.
Mr Gopalarao for the
Coll: approved of the ar-
-rangement and ordered
the Huildar to give effect to
it

The order is dated 30th June 1891.

The appeal is against this order. The appellant contends that

(1) when she appeared before the District Hakim according to notice she was told that unless she consented to give up scale with Kâk to Venkatramaiya, both the scales would be entered in his name. She did not therefore give the statement voluntarily.

(2). Neither her husband nor herself could alienate the hereditary Kâk in favor of a person of a different caste.

The points for consideration are -

1. Whether the statement before the District Hakim was voluntarily made
2. Whether the Kâk can be alienated in the manner stated above.

Shembaga Chetty
Vs
Muniswami Chetty
&
Ors

Hearing 26th June 1893 & 22/8/93
Guna Rao for
Venkatarao
Respt
24/10/92

Case fixed for hearing
13th April 1893

30/7/92

On the first point for consideration the learned advocate on either side has accepted as correct the finding of the lower Court that the statement was voluntarily made - and the appellant's counsel therefore confined his contention entirely to the second point - viz whether the Kâk can be alienated in the manner stated above.

Letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Kaira District, No 850 dated 16th March 1892, submitting the Vernacular file in Connection with the petition of Lingavannah, widow of Channaiya, late Shanbogue of Madihally of the Belur Taluk.

The facts of the case are as follows:—

1. On the 13th of November 1876, Nanaiah husband of the appellant Lingavannah presented a petition to the Amildar of the Kaira Taluk, stating that he had been suspended from duty for not having furnished the Survey accounts, but that as the period of the suspension was over he might be re-instated to his office, and that since it was impossible for him to

proceed

perform the work of the 11 villages comprising the Madihally Firka, & of these, Pattadakur &c might be given to one Ramiah, and separate Varaund made out in his name.

2. The Sheikdar of Madihally Firka brought to the notice of the Amildar of Kaveri Shanbogue Varaciah's conduct in disobeying certain orders given him and subsequently submitted Varaciah's re- signation for Madihally Firka Shanbogship in favor of one Narasimmachar. In his resignation of the 18th March 1877, Varaciah stated that the Shanbogship of Madihally Firka might be bestowed on his intimate friend Nara- simmachar, for he was unable to perform the duties of Madihally and Kuchally Firkas, his name being re- moved from it.

No 549 & 12th March 1877.

No 643 & 19th March 1877.

3. In his petition of the 21st March 1877, to the Amildar of Kaveri, Varaciah re- quested Cancellation of his resignation, by

7

2/

by which he sought the transfer of Madeleally Filla to Varaciamma Shan, on the ground that his Claimant had agreed to the arrangement he had therein contemplated and in his subsequent petition of the 19th April 1877 to the same Officer, he prayed for the transfer of the said Filla to Venkataramiah, the present working Shanbogue, on the plea that he possessed an older Filla Shanbogship in the Beluru Taluk and that he could not manage to do the duties of these two Filkas. He also deposed on the same date to this effect before the Amildar, and Venkataramiah accepted the offer.

No. 498 } 19th April 1877 }

4. In reporting the facts of the Case that Narasiah first nominated one Ramiah, then one Varaciamma Shan, and thirdly one Venkataramiah for Madeleally Filla Shanbogship, the Amildar stated that Narasiah was an illiterate man, not knowing to perform the duty of a Shanbogue, and that he often accepted and

Select

correspondingly when he was sent for to furnish the account of his Firka, and recommended Venkatarāmaiah, who was nominated by Varadaiah on the last occasion for Madihally Firka.

5. The 2nd Comm[r] sanctioned the recommendation for only 6 months, subject to a report on the qualification of the nominee at the end of that period. And the Amildar conveyed this sanction of the 2nd Comm[r] to Varadaiah and directed him to hand over charge of Madihally Firka to Venkatarāmaiah.

No 54 dated 4th May 1877.

No 219 of 8th May 1877.

6. In May 1881, Varadaiah presented a petition to the 2nd Comm[r] at Kaveripatna praying that the Madihally Firka Shanbogship which, at the time he went to Belur Taluk to enter upon his duty as Shanbogue of Kethohally in that Taluk, he entrusted to Venkatarāmaiah, might be restored to him.

7. This petition was referred to the Amildar for report.

No 328/87 of 12th May 1881.

8. In reply to the above, the Amildar submitted the

No 605 of 6th June 1881.

the previous Correspondence on the subject and stated that from this Correspondence it would appear that petitioner Narasiah was the Tahsildar of Madicherla Firka, and that Venkataramiah was appointed as Shanbogue of that Firka at Narasiah's own instance and under the circumstances that Narasiah was found to be an useless man, not capable of doing his work.

Upon this, the Dy Commr called for a fuller report of the case.

8. In July 1881, Narasiah presented a petition to the Amildar of Nagar, representing that he & Venkataramiah effected a division between themselves of the 11 villages of the Madicherla Firka (5 of them to himself and the remaining 6 to Venkataramiah) and praying that separate boundaries of the villages so divided might be entered in their names. With this, he presented the petition of Venkataramiah agreeing to the division set forth in Narasiah's

No 615 & 20th July 1881.

Naraciah's petition.

9. On the 26th of July 1881, Naraciah presented another petition to the Dy Commr, soliciting early orders in the matter of his and Venkata-ramiah's petitions (vide para above). And the Dy Commr referred this to the Amildar for report of facts. No 287 of 1st August 1881.

10. The Amildar reported that because early orders were not passed on Naraciah's petition to the Dy Commr for relaxation to him of the entire Mirasi Fields (vide para 6 supra), he took recourse to the amicable division between himself & Venkataramiah of the 11 villages of that Fieldha, and that no reference was for the-coming among the records that would indicate a re-port having been made on the qualification of Venkata-ramiah at the termination of the probationary period of 6 months allowed by the Dy Commr in his order No 54 (vide para 5 ante), and recommended for sanction the division so effected between them.

11

No 246 dated 16th May 1882

11. After examining Varaiah, the 2nd Comr accorded sanction to the division effected between the petitioner and Venkataramaiah, of the 11 villages of Madihally Firka, and observed that on the report of the work turned out by Varaiah, the division of the 2 Firkas would, if found necessary, be ordered and orders for inclusion of his name issued.

No 373 dated 12th June 1883

12. The Amildar reported that he examined & watched the work of Varaiah ever since he took charge of the Firka and after all, not only found him an useless hand, but that the work entrusted to him would suffer, unless a competent man was soon appointed, and recommended Venkataramiah in preference to bringing in a new man instead.

No 2838 dated 20th June 1883

13. The Sub Dy officer observed that Varaiah was incompetent to hold the Shanbogy office and must therefore be removed. But to add the charge of Madihally Firka would render work inconvenient, and should not therefore be

over

done. Another separate competent man should be found out and a report made.

14. The Addar of Belur recommended retention of Faraciah in service till emphatically found incapable of doing his duty, on the ground that although Faraciah was not a very shrewd man, yet he could discharge his easy work at a moderate and that the majority of Shanbags were of this category, whose services should not be dispensed with, save for grave offences such as treachery

No 1323 dated 18th December 1853

15. Thereupon Hiriyur Sub Dve officer Mr. T. Ananda Rao, referred the above report to the Assistant Commissioner Mr. Krishnarao for the favor of a report after a close scrutiny of the Shanbag's work at the Hiriyur evening jamabandy.

No 1066 dated 16th January 1854

16. In response to the above, the Asst Commr reported that Shanbag Faraciah

was

was a dullard and incapable of writing out the account himself independently. But he was not impertinent, a poor man having many children and having no other source of maintenance than the Shanbogship under dispute. That force another trial for a year might, he recommended be given him and orders issued to him to write out the accounts within that period, and such arrangement made for the transaction of work as would have called for in the cases of minor Shanbogs.

No 22 dated 9th February 1884

17. The Amildar of Belur reported to the Jamabandy Officer that Venkataramiah the Shanbog of Madihally Firka was irregular in his work, that he owned another Shanbogship of Organy village in the Hassan Taluk, that on account of these duplicate offices he could not satisfactorily discharge the duties, that he was only appointed recently to the Madihally Firka, that

he was not fit Kadaru
to it, and recommended
employment of such man
as would give security.
18. The Sub Dy Collector directed
that the Amildar should
choose a man who would
live in the Firka and also
give security. Venkata-
ramiah would comply
as much the better.
19. On the 6th of September
1884, Varadimmalhar
presented a petition to the
Sub Dy Collector of Hassan
applying for the vacant
Shanbogship in the Sub
Dy and offering to give
security if it was declined
upon him.

This petition was sent
to the Belur Taluk Amildar
for a report on the compe-
tence and solvency of the
petitioner & his being
employed as Shanbogue of
Madihally Firka.

20. With reference to
order No 588 (vide para
18 supra), the Amildar
reported that Varadiah
and

No 588 dated 28th July 1884.

No 1188 of 17th September 1884.

and Venkataramiah pleaded inability to tender security, and forwarded their depositions to that effect.

No. 859 dated 24th September 1884

21. The Subdy Officer directed election of such individuals as would offer both money and lands for security, and executed a Muchalika, and alluded him to Narasimmachar's application.

No. 1587 dated 27th October 1884

22. Adverting to the last sentence of the above para the Amildar stated that Narasimmachar was disposed to pay a security of Rs: 200/, if he were appointed Shekadar Shanbog of the 11 villages of Madihally Firka, and forwarded his statement for orders with the support that Narasimmachar was a decent and trustworthy man.

No. 249 dated 1st January 1887

23. The Chief Jailor, Ellapore Jail, forwarded petition of one Arasiah who was then undergoing imprisonment

enquirement, in which he prayed that the Stamp Office of Madhaly Pitta being his ancestral property, ~~the~~ his name might be entered in the name of his wife Lingam mah, and her father-in-law one Kalick appointed Guardian for her.

24. The Subn^e Officer in sending the above to the Amildar, observed that it was not feasible to comply with Varadiah's request therein mentioned, and directed the Amildar to ascertain if Venkata-ramiah had paid the security amount, or would pay it, and if not both to submit Varadamma's name with the name of an other Competent man for the 2 Sales formed in the Putta Potagi Settlement.

No. 1664 & 23^d January 188[illegible]

25. Adverting to the above, the

and that he would pay the security, and that the office should be restored to him.

29. Thereupon the deputy commissioner directed notices being issued to all the Kuka. dar relations of Varaiah for establishing their right to the office, and ordered the subject to be further reported on on the performance of the work.

c 339 dated 1st July 1884

30. Referring to the above, the Amildar reported that his claimants Varaiah and Varasimmiah appeared respecting their right to the office. Varaiah in his deposition stated that there were no other claimants to the Kambagy office than he and his sons, and that Varasimmiah was no hereditary and that Varaiah prayed that his own right be established.

c 949 8/4 7 8 4 original 1884

31. On the 17th of April 1885, Varaiah presented a petition to the Amildar of Belur, praying that

the Madhally Firka
Shanbogaship might be
declared on his election
and one Lakshmiah ap-
pointed Queneta during
his good behaviour, and
thereupon produced
a copy of the judgment
in Orig. Case No 98 of 1867-
-68 on the file of the late
Zilla Sheristé Court of Kaira.
In this judgment it was
declared that Narasiah
should be appointed to
the office of Madhally
Firka.

32. Referring to Govt Comte
order No 46 dated 24th
October 1887, calling for
a further report in the case,
the Collector submitted
that the previous correspondence
evidenced that in 1877,
Narasiah of his own ac-
cord transferred the Shan-
bogy office of Madhally
Firka to the name of Ven-
Kataramiah who had
no connection whatever
with it, on the plea
that he purchased Shanbogy
office

office & another place
in the Peiur Talak, and
that he found it hard
to do the duties of both
the offices. Subsequently
in the year 1881, Nanaah
and Venkataramiah
effected a division bet-
ween themselves, each
claiming certain vil-
lages of the disputed
Maliah Talaks, and
this arrangement was
ratified by the Dep.
Comm.r. Since then, Ra-
maiah not only proved
himself incompetent, but
also having been criminally
dealt with for the esp
ionage. This Shanbogg
office was a hereditary
one, and each office in
one member of that family
was prohibit to estrange
from the family itself.
Nukadare Nanaah
solicited that the bara-
-kur of the 2 villages might
be made out in his eldest
son's name, that one Lak-
shmiah, a relation of his

office

appointed Gumasta for Madhally Firka and that the 2nd King Swamy Venkataramiah as Gumasta for Bettadalur Firka. The request of Narasiah, the petitioner Amildar submitted, might be complied with inasmuch as it would restore to the family the office it had once held and accrue no loss to all concerned in the case.

33. On the 24th of August 1890, Lingamma, wife of Narasiah, deposed before the Amildar as follows that the hereditary rights of the 2 Scales of Madhally Firka should be entered in the name of her eldest son, that Venkataramiah who had been co-operating with her husband Narasiah, might be appointed as Gumasta for Madhally and that her brother Muddaiah Rangiah appointed for the other Bettadalur Firka. And on the 26th August 1890, Venkata-

Ramiah

Venkatacharyar stated that he obtained ~~the~~ K of Madiah ally with Luk from Subadar Varadiah in the year Durmu (1877-78) by paying him the sum of Rs. 400/- to the extent of which he had misappropriated Circuit Govt. money; that at the instance of Varadiah he gave him in the year Chitrabhanu Kart. Tally the Village; that after he was imprisoned for embezzlement in the year Parthiva, he (Venkatacharyar) continued to do the duties of all the villages (including those that had been given to Varadiah), and that under such circumstances the karanams of the 2 dales should be entered in his name.

34. The Amildar submitted the proceedings of the case after full investigation with a memorandum giving the brief history of it.

No. 809 dated 16th September 1890

35. The 2nd Comm[r] took down depositions from Venkataramiah and Linganmah ~~wife~~ widow of Narasiah, and acceded to the request of the parties addressed by them. This was to the effect that Madhally Sirka should be given with luck to Venkataramiah and it be ascertained entered in his name, that the Karanam of the Bettadalur Sirka should be made in the name of her son (Linganmah) Ranjundiah, that till Ranjundiah attained age, Venkataramiah shd act as his Gumasta, and that out of the Rs 289 amount of the Bettadalur Sirka, Venkataramiah should take Rs: 28/8, and the balance viz Rs: 260/- paid to Ranjoondiah or his guardian from the

Rs 289 dated 30th June 1891.

the Treasury direct.

36. In these foregoing circumstances of the case, the present appeal by Lingammah has been preferred.

A.V
6/5/11

26

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 .

No. 2001

Name of Petitioner. Lingammah

Village. Madikally

Taluk. Belur

District. Hassan

Date of Arri. 22.10.91

Date of Receipt. 24.11.91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

1 Appeal in time.
2 Stamp. Correct.
3. Case under Rule I para (1)

Submitted to the Council

11/1/92.

12/1/92

V L.R 20291-1

can pass
Pet, to be
pass order
to the
petitioner

12/1/92

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner's husband who was Pandaig of the two fiefs viz Bettadalur and Madikally died leaving a minor son Rangandiah in whose name Bettadalur fief was registered. But Madikally fief came to be passed into the hands of one Venkatramiah. So the petitioner applied to the Taluk and District Authorities for the Registry of Madikally

firka in her own name
and requested them
to permit her brother
one Kaduvinah, to act as
gumasta. On the 26th June
1891, the Deputy Commr's
Kacheri took down her
statement that she (was)
appeared before the
Deputy Commissioner
according to notice issued.
When she was threatened
that both the scales
would be registered in
the name of Venkatramiah
if she did not agree to
the medikally scales
being registered in
Venkatramiah's name and
to the appointment of
Venkataramiah as gumasta
for Ramjandiah for the
Bettadalur scales. A statement
ment was forced out
her to the above
effect as required by
the Deputy Commissioner.

Then an order No 250 dated 1/7/91 Appointing the said Venkatramiah as Shanbog of Madihally Firka and Sumasta to the petitioner's son for the Bettadalur Firka was passed

In this appeal she Contends that (a) the Shanbogship of the two Firks is her husbands ancestral property (b) that Venkatramiah, being of another sect has no claims to it (c) that the Deputy Comm's order is contrary to Hindu Law (d) That the statement given by her was the result of the Deputy Commissioner's threat to register the whole Shanbog Kuk in the name of the said

Venkatramiah.

"Petitioner prays that the above order may be cancelled, that the Pradhanilly pirka may be registered in her own name and that her brother Ramaiah may be permitted to act as gumasta."

Translation of the Deputy Commissioner's order No 260 dated 1/7/91 given to the petitioner.

Lingamma and Venkatramiah's depositions were taken before me. What they ask for in their statements is granted, that is to say (1) The sharing

-ship of Madinacity firka
must be registered in
Venkatramiah's name.
(2) that of Bettadalur
firka must be registered
in the name of Ranjund
age 8 years the eldest son of Narasiah
late Shanbog. Venkata-
ramiah must be made
his gumasta till he
attains the age of dis-
cretion (3). Rs 29/8 out of
and
the Fatigee money of the
Bettadalur firka viz.
Rs 6/8 must be paid to
Venkatramiah, and Rs 10
to Ranjundiah's mother
or any person under
whose guardianship
he may be. These pay-
ments must be made
directly from the treasury

Copied C.G. Subba Rau
11/1/92

Re 139 R.

31

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Subversion 2 Oct 92

The accompanying Petition No. 2001
dated 22nd October 91, received at the
Dewan's Office from Linganmah
wife of Varadiah, Headman
Shanbogue of Kaadihally,
Belur Taluk,

L.R 202-91-2

is forwarded, together with its four
enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan Dist. for submission
of Proceedings and a precis
thereof.

Letter from Asst. No. 1421 dated 14/12/92 Asst. the Dist. Hassan 18th Dec. 1892 Received 19/12/92

By Order,

Dewan's Secretary.

BANGALORE,
12th January 1892.
20
Draft
9
7/12

(General Serial No. 30). 12322

189 /. P. 66

From
the Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

To
The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore.

Dated 10.
Despatched 12. } March 1892
Received

Enclosures No. petition & P.P. file

General No. 850
No.

Submitting proceedings
Connected with the
petition from Linganna
widow of Narasiah
late Thandagu of
Madihalli Belur Taluk
as called for.

Petn Deptt
Recd 14/3/92

Venkatramiah
- sanyasi petition
by Mr 25-th inst
by Mr 17.3.92

Precis Submitted
6/5/92 HV

A3
15-3-92

33

No. 850
Secy

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Dated Hassan 17th March/92.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to Ferwad
Memo No 139 of the 29th January
1892, forwarding the petition
of Lingamma, widow of Narasaiya
late Shanbogue of Madihally in
the Belur Taluk, I have the
honor to submit the Kerna-
-culan File.-

2. The petition with enclosures
received with the above is here-
-with returned.-

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

for Deputy Commissioner
Hassan Dist.

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದರು.

ಅ ಮಾರಾಟಗಾರರು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದರು.

ಅ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾ

8-5-93 5

No. 156
2001

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

6/8 May 1893

(7)

L.R 202-91-5

Endorsement granted to Lingamma widow of Narasaiya of Belur, Hassan District

in reply to her Petition Registered No. 2001/A.S.156 dated 24-11-91 applying against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan appointing Venkatanarayya as Sharistadar of the Municipality pending disposal in accordance with an agreement between Petitioner and the said Venkatanarayya.

Petitioner is informed that as neither party appeared on the date fixed for hearing, and as the proceedings do not support Petitioner's allegation that her statement before the Dy. Commr. dated 29th June 1892 was not made voluntarily, her appeal has been dismissed

2. The enclosures are herewith returned.

8/5/93

"By Order"

Draft-

for Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

37

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

(6)

Appeal No. 156 of 1891

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Linjamma, wife of Chandrag Hariah, Hadihalli, Belur Taluk.		Venkatamma

L.R 202-91-4

Decision. dated 20 April 1893.

The appeal is against an order of the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan, directing (that, on application the Respondent, who at first held the office of the patel of Hadihalli consisting of 11 villages, under an arrangement entered into by appellant's husband, and afterwards given it into their charge, for himself, Bettadahalli and 5 other villages and leaving to appellant's husband Hadihalli and 4 other villages) the appointment of the Hadihalli patel as well as of the Bettadahalli patel. The appellant urged that the arrangement was not free

On the date fixed for hearing, neither appellant nor respondent appeared in person or by pleader. The proceedings do not explain the appellant's allegation that the Respondent had by fraud, &c, not made voluntarily. The Deputy Commissioner's order affirmed appellant's application the amicable arrangement entered

suit between the parties, which record is
sufficient to warrant an affirmance, the
law appertaining to Canadian Extradition
cases remains majority.

The appeal is dismissed.

By order

Mr

1/5.

Asst Registrar

15050
Bail 284-92

Copy of the orders pronounced at the Supreme
Court Chambers, this to accompany file record
with his Lordship's compliments 3rd March 92.

By order

Mr

Asst Registrar